



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

generally, or to property held by it within the state; and a corporation is a debtor of its stockholders only in a metaphysical sense, not in a sense that it may be garnished as such. It holds their stock only where it has its domicile, and subject to the laws of that state. This the court holds true, although the Ohio statutes authorize attachment of stocks and interests therein, and permit the garnishment of a foreign corporation for the debt of a non-resident defendant. For a similar case, denying garnishment of stocks held as a pledge in a third state, see *Winslow v. Fletcher*, 53 Conn. 390.

INJUNCTION—EQUITY—BOYCOTT—BECK ET AL. VS. RAILWAY TEAMSTERS' PROTECTIVE UNION ET AL., 77 N. W. Rep. 13 (Mich.).—The complainants, doing a general milling business, discharged several teamsters in their employ, because of a demand for increased wages, coupled with a demand to sign a "scale" of wages issued by defendants. Because of complainants' refusal to sign this "scale" the defendants took active measures to, and did materially hinder them in their business, driving away customers and issuing notices for people to boycott the firm. The Court of Equity granted an injunction against the defendants restraining them from further interfering with complainants, following *Allen v. Flood* (1898), Law T. Rep. 156.

PERSONS—MARRIED WOMEN—LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF HUSBAND AS AGENT—SHANE V. LYONS, 51 N. E. 976 (Mass.).—The Massachusetts statutes having given married women the right to hold, manage and dispose of her property in the same manner as if she were sole, she is "civilly responsible for personal injuries inflicted, not in her presence, upon a third person, by her husband, while acting within the scope of his authority as her agent," it further appearing that she appointed him her agent of her own free will and without coercion from him.

POLICE REGULATION—SUNDAY LAW—CLASS LEGISLATION—BARBER SHOPS—STATE V. PETIT, 77 N. W. Rep. 225 (Minn.).—A statute prohibited all labor on Sunday excepting works of necessity and charity. It expressly provides that the keeping open of a barber shop on Sunday for the purpose of cutting hair and shaving beards not to be a work of necessity or charity. As to other kinds of labor or business, it was left to be determined as a question of fact. This statute was held not to be obnoxious to the objection of being class legislation. Buck, J., dissenting.

PRIVILEGED COMMUNICATIONS—ATTORNEY AND CLIENT—TESTIMONY AS TO CONTENTS OF EXECUTED INSTRUMENT—FAYERWEATHER ET AL. V. RICH ET AL., 90 Fed. Rep. 13.—*Held*, that the reason of the rule protecting communications between attorney and client does not extend to the contents of any document put into writing by the attorney for his client; and an attorney who prepared a codicil to the will of a client, since deceased, should state whether the codicil, since destroyed, was executed, and what were its contents, though he cannot (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 835, 836) be required to testify as to the transactions or communications leading up to its execution.

TELEGRAPHS AND TELEPHONES—PREFERENTIAL LIENS FOR LABOR AND MATERIALS—KEELYN V. CAROLINA MUT. TELEPHONE AND TELEGRAPH CO., ETC., 90 Fed. Rep. 29.—The doctrine of the federal courts in *Fosdick v. Schall*, 99 U. S. 235, and *Bound v. Ry. Co.*, 50 Fed. 314, allowing claims of those furnishing labor and supplies necessary to keep a railroad a going concern priority over its mortgage indebtedness, held, applicable to telephone and telegraph companies, which have power of eminent domain, and which are recognized important public